

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Vincent Johnson, ) Civil Action No.: 4:12-cv-00390-RBH  
                    )  
Plaintiff,         )  
                    )  
v.                  ) **ORDER**  
                    )  
                    )  
Patrick Donahoe, Sandra Williams, )  
Beverly Brooks, and Paul         )  
Christenson,         )  
                    )  
Defendants.         )  
                    )

---

Plaintiff Vincent Johnson, proceeding pro se, filed this action against Defendants Patrick Donahoe, Sandra Williams, Beverly Brooks, and Paul Christenson, seeking damages for an alleged illegal firing. Defendants Williams, Brooks, and Christenson filed a motion to dismiss. This matter is now before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) for the District of South Carolina. In light of Plaintiff's response indicating his consent to dismiss Defendants Williams, Brooks, and Christenson, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court grant the motion to dismiss.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Neither party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of

objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’ ”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is

**ORDERED** that Defendants Williams, Brooks, and Christenson’s motion to dismiss is **GRANTED** and that Defendants Williams, Brooks, and Christenson are hereby **DISMISSED**. All motions pertaining to these defendants are deemed moot.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ R. Bryan Harwell

---

R. Bryan Harwell

United States District Judge

January 23, 2013  
Florence, South Carolina